

is using the F-18 CD, which is the latest model. The service life on those airplanes is coming due and there is no replacement for them.

In this budget that is coming up tomorrow, what we do is replace some of the life cycle in the aircraft that we have been using prior to that in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We take a look at something my friend has fought for, impact aid that we took out of the budget, and to be able to provide for that. He and I agreed we do not have as much as we would like in that.

I also look at Captain O'Grady. Captain O'Grady, when he was shot down over that portion of the world, told me personally, he said, "DUKE, I did not have the training, the ACM time that we need," the air combat maneuvering.

I would ask my colleagues to take a look at what the needs are in defense. We need to support our kids. Support the bill tomorrow, and do what is right.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute my name for that of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] during special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE HURRY-UP-AND-WAIT SCHEDULE OF CONGRESS, AND THE HANDLING OF ETHICS COMMITTEE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, those who saw the scheduling colloquy a few minutes ago absorbed another very peculiar development here in the House. You see, at 2 in the afternoon, at 3 o'clock perhaps, a little bit in the middle of the workday for most American families, the House quit for the day. We are now at a point in our debate where we can debate some of the issues, but the official proceedings, here in the middle of the workday the House concluded its proceedings.

This is at a time when we near a Government shutdown, two of the conference reports on appropriations bills have not even been presented to this House, and according to the scheduling colloquy, it appears that one of them, one of the two, is a possibility for tomorrow, on the shutdown day, and the other one we got no indication of whatsoever.

The even more peculiar thing about this hurry-up-and-wait schedule that exists here in the Congress was the portion of the scheduling colloquy that related to the subject of ethics. It was only about a week ago that not just any bill but a measure concerning a

rule on book royalties was referred not by just a Democrat, or not just by a Republican, but by the unanimous vote of an equally divided committee, half Republicans and half Democrats, the House Ethics Committee asked for a unanimous rule, or asked for a rule unanimously, I might say, to be in effect by the end of this year concerning book royalties. It was sent over to the Committee on Rules.

Members will recall that they took this action in a letter dated December 6, upbraiding and reprimanding the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] in regard to books and in regard to repeated ethical violations here in the House. After finding three clear violations of the rules of conduct of the House, they said in addition, with regard to the book "To Renew America," the one published through Mr. Murdoch's company, they said that

Concerning the publication of your book "To Renew America," while the amount involved greatly exceeds the financial bounds of any book contract contemplated at the time the current rules were drafted, the committee strongly questions the appropriateness of what could be described as an attempt by you to capitalize on your office with reference to this book.

They go on to say that, at a minimum, what the Speaker has done creates the impression, and this is their words, this bipartisan committee, " * * * of exploiting one's office for personal gain." They say the conduct was basically at such a level that to be sure no other Member of this House ever does this again, we need a rule on the books, the same kind of rule that would have been on the books had there been any real commitment to true ethical reform in this House on the first day back on January 4, 1995, because that is when it could have been adopted and when it should have been adopted.

But even after waiting almost a year, they say unanimously on a bipartisan basis, "Such a perception" regarding this book, and again I quote them, "is especially troubling when it pertains to the office of the Speaker of the House, a constitutional office regarding the highest standards of ethical conduct, and so the committee has drafted an amendment to the House rules to treat income from book royalties as part of outside earned income subject to the annual limit of House rule 47. The committee will propose this resolution to take effect January 1, 1996."

Mr. Speaker, when asked about that today, the majority leader said, "I will not prejudice the committee process. Anybody can go file a bill. Maybe the Committee on Rules will get to it and maybe it will not." He knows full well from reading the morning papers that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has said, and I quote, that he is "unalterably opposed to even the concept that you would want to limit book royalties"; that is to say, unalterably opposed to doing what a unanimous Ethics Committee recommended because of the scandal associated with

the Speaker's book contract with Rupert Murdoch. So apparently we are going to approach this week, we are going to approach next week, we are going to approach the end of 1995, and have no real ethics reform.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, this is not the result of the action of one chair of one committee. The Speaker could bring this rule change to the floor right now. It need not wait until the sun sets, if it ever does here in Washington today. No, indeed. We could be moving forward on the issue of ethics, but in this House, whether it is lobby reform or gift ban or campaign finance reform, the slogan seems to be "Just say no or just say Newt." They seem to mean the same thing.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2661, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FISCAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight have until midnight tonight, Thursday, December 14, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 2661.

It is my understanding that this request has been cleared with the minority leader's office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

THE MATERIAL GIRL OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION: SECRETARY OF ENERGY O'LEARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am understanding that the House has ceased its activities here. However, the rest of Congress is working in their offices, answering constituent relations and working on active legislation. If the gentleman cares to take the afternoon off, it is fine with me, but the rest of the House is working.

That is not what I want to talk about. I want to talk about the Clinton administration's material girl. Secretary O'Leary has leased, at taxpayers' expense, for overseas travel the same luxury jet that Madonna uses. Now Clinton's material girl has been overseas 16 times in the last 3 years. She has been out of the country 50 percent more days than Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Secretary of State Warren Christopher's responsibilities include foreign policy and foreign relations. When he gets off an airplane overseas, when you see his face and him stepping off an airplane, he is doing his job. But the material girl, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, is responsible for civilian nuclear waste, Department of Defense stockpile and safety, Department of Defense nuclear waste, the national energy labs,

all inside the United States, power marketing administrations, strategic oil reserves, all of which are within the United States of America, but the material girl's overseas trips are also expensive. They are as high as \$720,000 each. Several of these trips have expenses that are unaccounted for, some as high as \$150,000. One of these trips, the same luxury jet that Madonna uses, Secretary O'Leary took 51 staffers and 68 guests. It cost the taxpayers \$560,000. There is only about \$70,000 that is currently unaccounted for.

That is why the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and myself have requested the Government Accounting Office to do an audit, so we hope it will be done early next year. I think it is time that we stop this misuse of taxpayers' money and account for the expenses that we cannot account for at this point.

Mr. Speaker, this excessiveness, this mismanagement, this extravagance, is just the tip of the iceberg. It started off with GAO report that highlighted problems about management at the Department of Energy. They lacked focus, they had an admission a minute.

Then there was Vice President GORE's National Performance Review, who said within the Department of Energy the environmental management group was 40 percent inefficient and it was going to cost taxpayers \$70 billion over the next 30 years if something is not done. Then we found out there were 529 public relations employees at the Department of Energy, one personal media consultant for the Secretary of Energy herself; and then there was the private investigative firm, which she paid \$56,500 to find out who the unfavorable were in the press and in Congress. I was number four on the list. Then there was her personal friend that she hired at \$95,166 year plus \$12,000 living expenses for the department conflict resolution officer.

We have a lot of redundancy in Government, and we need to eliminate that out of the Department of Energy too. Two-thirds of the budget comes through the Department of Defense. There is duplication of effort within the labs. There is the nationalized oil fields at Elk Hills, CA. We have private companies that extract oil from the earth. There are the Power Marketing Administrations that also are duplicative of the private sector.

That is why I am leading the task force to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency, to remove the waste, consolidate the duplication, transfer to the private sector that which they do best, and eliminate the parts of Government that are unnecessary. Each time the material girl, Secretary O'Leary's mismanagement comes to the press, this effort gains support. It highlights the fact that something must be done.

This process of verifying has uncovered something else, though, that is probably worse than anything you have heard so far. That is that the material

girl has transferred from the Department of the Interior \$500,000 to the government of India to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival. Five hundred thousand dollars. What is so upsetting to me about this is that I can only think of the deficit we are running this year. I can only think of the budget we are dealing with. To spend \$500,000 to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival is taking away from our children's future. It is borrowed money that they are going to have to pay back. It is wrong. It is time to stop this wasteful spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency. The only way we can do that is to continue with this effort and this legislation. It is needed to balance the budget and it will stop the unnecessary spending.

□ 1445

SOCIAL POLICIES SHOULD REFLECT LATEST BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of H.R. 2748, a bill to prevent the potentially devastating consequences of discrimination based on genetic information. I ask my colleagues to join us in support of this critical legislation. Currently 26 of our colleagues have cosponsored the legislation.

As Chair of the Women's Health Task Force of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I closely followed reports earlier this year that increased funding for breast cancer research had resulted in the discovery of the BRCA1 gene-link to breast cancer. While the obvious benefits of the discovery include potential lifesaving early detection and intervention, the inherent dangers of access to genetic information are just becoming evident.

There is increasing concern that individuals will be denied access to health care and that employers might screen employees to eliminate those who could cause a rise in group premiums. The following actual cases document the cause for concern:

A 24-year-old healthy and insured woman is asked to sign a lifetime waiver exempting her from breast cancer coverage because of familial tendencies.

An insured, previously healthy man suffered a heart attack. After DNA-based testing revealed a hereditary form of high cholesterol, his insurance company refused to pay the hospital bills or cover future treatment for cardiovascular disease.

As our knowledge and understanding of the biomedical genesis of human health and disease increases, our social policies and ethical responsibilities need to be adjusted accordingly.

H.R. 2748, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 1995 contains four major provisions. It prohibits insurance providers from: First, denying or canceling health insurance coverage; or, second, varying the premiums, terms and conditions of health insurance coverage on the basis of genetic information; third, requesting or requiring an individual to disclose genetic information; and fourth, disclosing genetic information without the prior written consent of the individual.

The bill is uniquely focused, comprehensive, timely and includes effective enforcement mechanisms. It is focused on the issues of insurance discrimination and privacy as they relate to genetic information. It comprehensively covers all types of insurance providers including self-funded and ERISA plans. It is timely in that it tackles insurance discrimination and privacy issues related to genetic information before they become epidemic. It provides both State and Federal measures to ensure effective enforcement.

Grave concern about these issues and enthusiastic support for the bill has come from the American Cancer Society, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, and the Council for Responsible Genetics. The National Action Plan on Breast Cancer, the NIH-DOE Working Group on Ethical, Legal and Social Implications of Human Genome Research and the National Advisory Council for Human Genome Research have joined together to address the issue of genetic discrimination and health insurance. Their work has resulted in development of four policy recommendations. Those recommendations provide the foundation for Federal legislation to prevent discrimination on the basis of genetic information. This bill encompasses those recommendations.

This bill, which addresses the profound questions about who will have access to genetic information and how this information will be used by others, is critically important to the health and well-being of this Nation's women, men and children and our future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NO FUNDS FOR THE TREASURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House debated H.R. 2621, a bill which would, in my opinion, force a default of the U.S. Treasury on U.S. debt and forestall payment, not only of principal and interest on U.S. debt for